

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/027,204	12/21/2001	George L. King	10276-066001 1396		
26161 75	590 03/02/2004		EXAMINER		
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST			GITOMER, RALPH J		
BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1651	1651	
		DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/027,204	KING, GEORGE L.				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ralph Gitomer	1651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment whice	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the transition of the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFF extension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply of ter than three months after the mailing of	date of the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension and of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or (2)				
 filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 February 2004</u>. A Notice of 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF) 	Appellant's Brief must be filed w					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
$3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): <u>none</u> .					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>16-22</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
10.	,	lactomes				
		Ralph Gitomer Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1651				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: There is no patentable distinction between the invention as claimed and the reference of record, Ceolotto, because the progression of diabetes complications are inherent in the disorder and are encompassed by "relevant to the study of the development of diabetic complications.".